arXiv:math/9812079v1 [math.OA] 14 Dec 1998

A MICROSTATES APPROACH TO RELATIVE FREE ENTROPY

DIMITRI SHLYAKHTENKO

1. Introduction.

Let $X_1, \dots, X_n \in (M, \tau)$ be a family of non-commutative random variables in a tracial W^*-probability space, and let $B \subset M$ be a unital subalgebra. Voiculescu has introduced in [7] a free entropy quantity

$$\chi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B).$$

His approach involved non-commutative Hilbert transform and is algebraic in nature. In the case that $B = \mathbb{C}$, this quantity is denoted $\chi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n)$, and its properties are very similar to those of the free entropy $\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ introduced by Voiculescu in [4] using microstates; in fact, it may very well be that the two quantities coinside.

Using the microstates approach to free entropy, we introduce in this paper a quantity $\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | B)$ which has several properties in common $\chi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B)$.

The infinitesimal change of variables formula for χ involves conjugate variables, introduced by Voiculescu in order to define χ^*. Both χ and χ^* have the same behavior under compression by matrix units in the case that $B = M_n \otimes D$, where M_n is the algebra of $n \times n$ matrices. This behavior is a useful technical tool; for example, it was used to prove certain maximization results for matrices of non-commutative random variables in [1].

If the $X_1, \dots, X_n$ are free from B, we have

$$\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | B) = \chi(X_1, \dots, X_n),$$

provided that B can be embedded into the ultrapower of the hyperfinite II_1 factor; a similar fact holds for χ^*.

If $X_1, \dots, X_n$ are free from the algebra generated by $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$ and B, then

$$\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_m | B) = \chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | B) + \chi(Y_1, \dots, Y_m | B);$$

a similar fact holds for χ^*.

We prove a maximization result for χ (which is essentially identical to the one for χ^*), namely $\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | B)$ attains its maximum among all $X_1, \dots, X_n$ with $\sum_i \tau(X_i^2) = n$ if and only if $X_1, \dots, X_n$ is a free semicircular family, free from B (we need as an assumption that B can be embedded into the ultrapower of the hyperfinite II_1 factor). Lastly, the infinitesimal change of variables formula for $\chi(\cdots | B)$ involves conjugate variables used to define $\chi^*(\cdots : B)$ (see [7]).

It is interesting to note that $\chi(\cdot | B)$ has an interpretation as a relative entropy, which suggests a similar interpretation for $\chi^*(\cdot : B)$. Indeed, we show that if $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$ are generators of B, then $\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | B) = \chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | Y_1, \dots, Y_m)$, where the latter entropy has properties of a relative entropy of $X_1, \dots, X_n$ and $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$. We caution the reader

---

Date: February 1, 2008.

Research supported in part by a National Science Foundation postdoctoral fellowship.

that we use a definition of $\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m)$ which may be different from the one used by Voiculescu in [4], although the two quantities are related.

2. Relative Free Entropy $\chi(\cdot|B)$.

Let (M,τ) be a tracial non-commutative probability space, and consider self-adjoint non-commutative random variables $X_1,\dots,X_n$, $Y_1,\dots,Y_m \in M$. We denote by M_k the algebra of $k\times k$ matrices, and by M_k^{sa} the set of self-adjoint $k\times k$ matrices. Recall that the set

$$\Gamma_R(X_1,\dots,X_n;k,l,\epsilon)\subset (M_k^{\mathrm{sa}})^n$$

was defined by Voiculescu in [4] as the set of those $(x_1,\dots,x_n)\in(M_k^{\mathrm{sa}})^n$, for which $\|x_i\|\le R$ and for any $p\le l$, and all $i_1,\dots,i_p$

$$|\tau_n(x_{i_1},\dots,x_{i_p})-\tau(X_{i_1}\dots X_{i_p})|<\epsilon.$$

Here τ_n stands for the normalized trace on the matrices (so that $\tau_n(1)=1$).

Definition 2.1. For $y_1,\dots,y_n\in M_k$, define

$$\begin{aligned}&\Gamma_R(X_1,\dots,X_n|y_1,\dots,y_m[Y_1,\dots,Y_m];k,l,\epsilon)\\ &=\{x_1,\dots,x_n\in(M_k^{\mathrm{sa}})^n:(x_1,\dots,x_n,y_1,\dots,y_m)\\ &\qquad\in\Gamma_R(X_1,\dots,X_n,Y_1,\dots,Y_m;k,l,\epsilon)\}\end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.2. Note that for this set to be nonempty, we must have that

$$(y_1,\dots,y_m)\in\Gamma_R((Y_1,\dots,Y_m:X_1,\dots,X_n;l,k,\epsilon).$$

This set would be empty if $W^*(Y_1,\dots,Y_m)$ were not embeddable into the ultrapower of the hyperfinite II_1 factor.

Definition 2.3. Let λ denote Lebesgue measure on $(M_k^{\mathrm{sa}})^n$ corresponding to its Hilbert space structure coming from the non-normalized trace. Define successively

$$\chi_R(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m,l,\epsilon)= \tag{2.1}$$

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{1}{k^2}\sup_{\substack{(y_1,\dots,y_m)\in\\ \Gamma_R(Y_1,\dots,Y_m;k,l,\epsilon)}} \tag{2.2}$$

$$\log\lambda\Gamma_R(X_1,\dots,X_n|y_1,\dots,y_m[Y_1,\dots,Y_m];k,l,\epsilon)+\frac{n}{2}\log k \tag{2.3}$$

$$\chi_R(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m)=\inf_{l,\epsilon}\chi_R(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m;l,\epsilon)$$

$$\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m)=\sup_R\chi_R(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m).$$

The last quantity is called the relative free entropy of the n-tuple $(X_1,\dots,X_n)$ with respect to the m-tuple $(Y_1,\dots,Y_m)$.

If ω is a free ultrafilter on $\mathbb{N}$, then one can also define $\chi^\omega(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m)$ exactly as in (2.1), but replacing $\limsup$ by $\lim_{k\to\omega}$.

Remark 2.4. It is not clear whether our definition of $\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m)$ coninsides with that of Voiculescu (see [4]). His definition corresponds to defining

$$\chi_R(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m;l,k,\epsilon) = \limsup_k \log \frac{\lambda\Gamma_R(X_1,\dots,X_n,Y_1,\dots,Y_m;k,l,\epsilon)}{\lambda\Gamma_R(Y_1,\dots,Y_m;k,l,\epsilon)} + \frac{n}{2}\log k.$$

The connection to our definition can be made as follows: let

$$f(y_1,\dots,y_m) = \lambda\Gamma_R(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m[y_1,\dots,y_m];k,l,\epsilon)$$

Then Voiculescu's definition corresponds to taking as $\chi_R(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m;l,k,\epsilon)$ the average of f over $\Gamma_R(Y_1,\dots,Y_m;l,k,\epsilon)$. It follows that the quantity obtained in our definition is bigger than that of Voiculescu. We mention that it is possible to define, in the spirit of [4] the relative entropy as

$$\chi'(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m) = \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n,Y_1,\dots,Y_m) - \chi(Y_1,\dots,Y_m : X_1,\dots,X_n).$$

Such a definition corresponds to defining $\chi_R(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m;l,k,\epsilon)$ as the average of f over $\Gamma_R(Y_1,\dots,Y_m : X_1,\dots,X_n)$. We don't know whether χ' coincides with Voiculescu's or our definition of χ, and whether Voiculescu's and our definitions are the same or different. Note, however, that we always have:

Proposition 2.5. *Let $X_1,\dots,X_n$, $Y_1,\dots,Y_m$ be non-commutative random variables. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n,Y_1,\dots,Y_m) - \chi(Y_1,\dots,Y_m) \le \\ \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n,Y_1,\dots,Y_m) - \chi(Y_1,\dots,Y_m : X_1,\dots,X_n) \le \\ \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m) = -\infty$, then $\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n,Y_1,\dots,Y_m) = -\infty$.

Proof. In the case that $\chi(Y_1,\dots,Y_m)$ is finite, the inequalities follow from the discussion in Remark 2.4. If

$$\chi(Y_1,\dots,Y_m) = -\infty,$$

then

$$\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n,Y_1,\dots,Y_m) = -\infty.$$

If $\chi(Y_1,\dots,Y_m) \neq -\infty$, then

$$\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m) = -\infty$$

implies that

$$\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n,Y_1,\dots,Y_m) \le -\infty + \chi(Y_1,\dots,Y_m) = -\infty.$$

□

Notation 2.6. We shall write

$$\Gamma_R(X_1,\dots,X_n|y_1,\dots,y_m;l,k,\epsilon)$$

for

$$\Gamma_R(X_1,\dots,X_n|y_1,\dots,y_m[Y_1,\dots,Y_m];l,k,\epsilon)$$

when the $Y_1,\dots,Y_m$ are understood.

Proposition 2.7. *If $p < m$, then $\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | Y_1, \dots, Y_m) \leq \chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | Y_1, \dots, Y_p)$, and a similar inequality holds for χ_R and χ^ω.*

Proof. We have the inclusion

$$\Gamma_R(X_1, \dots, X_n | y_1, \dots, y_m[Y_1, \dots, Y_m]; l, k, \epsilon) \subset \Gamma_R(X_1, \dots, X_n | y_1, \dots, y_p[Y_1, \dots, Y_p]; l, k, \epsilon)$$

for all $(y_1, \dots, y_m) \in M_k$. It follows that

$$\sup_{(y_1,\dots,y_m)} \lambda\Gamma_R(X_1, \dots, X_n | y_1, \dots, y_m[Y_1, \dots, Y_m]; l, k, \epsilon) \leq \sup_{(y_1,\dots,y_p)} \lambda\Gamma_R(X_1, \dots, X_n | y_1, \dots, y_p[Y_1, \dots, Y_p]; l, k, \epsilon)$$

which implies the desired inequality. □

Proposition 2.8. $\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | Y_1, \dots, Y_m) \leq \chi(X_1, \dots, X_n : Y_1, \dots, Y_m)$.

Proof. We clearly have

$$\Gamma_R(X_1, \dots, X_n | y_1, \dots, y_m[Y_1, \dots, Y_m]; l, k, \epsilon) \subset \pi\Gamma_r(X_1, \dots, X_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_m; l, k, \epsilon),$$

where π denotes the projection from $(M_k^{\mathrm{sa}})^n \times (M^{\mathrm{sa}})^m$ onto $(M_k^{\mathrm{sa}})^n$. □

Corollary 2.9. *Let $c^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum \tau(X_i^2)$. Then*

$$\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | Y_1, \dots, Y_m) \leq \frac{n}{2} \log 2\pi e c^2.$$

The same estimate holds for χ_R and χ^ω.

Proof. We have $\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_m) \leq \chi(X_1, \dots, X_n) \leq \frac{n}{2} \log 2\pi e c^2$, the last inequality by [4]. □

Definition 2.10. Let $B \subset M$ be a unital subalgebra of M. We define the free entropy of $(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ relative to B to be

$$\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | B) = \inf_m \inf_{Y_1,\dots,Y_m \in B} \chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | Y_1, \dots, Y_m).$$

If ω is a free ultrafilter on the natural numbers, then we define $\chi^\omega(X_1, \dots, X_n | B)$ in the obvious way.

Remark 2.11. For $\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | B)$ to be finite, we must have that for all $Y_1, \dots, Y_m \in B$,

$$\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | Y_1, \dots, Y_m) \neq -\infty.$$

By Remark 2.2, this subsumes that B is embeddable into the ultrapower of the hyperfinite II_1 factor.

Proposition 2.12. *If $D \subset B$ is a unital subalgebra, then*

$$\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | B) \leq \chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | D).$$

In particular, we have $\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | B) \leq \chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | \mathbb{C}) = \chi(X_1, \dots, X_n)$. The same conclusion holds for χ replaced with χ^ω.

Proof. The first inequality is because in computing $\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | D)$ we take the infimum over a smaller set. The equality between $\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n | \mathbb{C})$ and $\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ is left to the reader. □

Proposition 2.13. *Let* X_i^j, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$ *be non-commutative random variables. Assume that* $X_1, \dots, X_n$ *are such that as* $j \to \infty$, *the joint distribution of* $(X_1^j, \dots, X_n^j)$ *and* B *converges to the joint distribution of* B *and* $X_1, \dots, X_n$. *Let* $Y_1^j, \dots, Y_m^j$ *be such that they converge in distribution to* $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$. *Assume that there exists a finite constant* R, *so that* $\sup_{i,j} \|X_i^j\|, \|Y_i^j\|, \|X_i\|, \|Y_i\| < R$. *Then*

$$\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n|B) \geq \limsup_j \chi(X_1^j, \dots, X_n^j|B)$$

and

$$\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n|Y_1, \dots, Y_m) \geq \limsup_j \chi(X_1^j, \dots, X_n^j|Y_1^j, \dots, Y_m^j).$$

The same conclusion holds for χ^ω *instead of* χ.

Proof. Clearly, only the second inequality needs to be proved. It follows from the following inclusion, true for sufficiently large j:

$$\Gamma_R(X_1^j, \dots, X_n^j|y_1, \dots, y_m[Y_1^j, \dots, Y_n^j]; k, l, \epsilon/2) \subset \\ \Gamma_R(X_1, \dots, X_n|y_1, \dots, y_m[Y_1, \dots, Y_m; k, l, \epsilon),$$

since it implies that

$$\sup_{y_1,\dots,y_m} \log \lambda \Gamma_R(X_1^j, \dots, X_n^j|y_1, \dots, y_m[Y_1^j, \dots, Y_n^j]; k, l, \epsilon/2) \leq \\ \sup_{y_1,\dots,y_m} \log \lambda \Gamma_R(X_1, \dots, X_n|y_1, \dots, y_m[Y_1, \dots, Y_m; k, l, \epsilon),$$

which in turn implies the desired inequality. □

Proposition 2.14. *Assume that* $Z_1, \dots, Z_r \in W^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_m)$. *Then*

$$\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n|Y_1, \dots, Y_m) \leq \chi(X_1, \dots, X_n|Z_1, \dots, Z_r),$$

and similarly for χ *replaced with* χ^ω.

Proof. Fix $\epsilon > 0$, $l > 0$, $R > 0$. Then there exists non-commutative polynomials $p_1, \dots, p_r$ in m variables, such that

$$(X_1, \dots, X_n, p_1(Y_1, \dots, Y_m), \dots, p_r(Y_1, \dots, Y_m))$$

approximate

$$(X_1, \dots, X_n, Z_1, \dots, Z_r)$$

strongly to any desired accuracy. It follows, that for a suitable choice of such polynomials, there exist $\epsilon > \epsilon' > 0$, $l' > l > 0$ and $R' > R > 0$ such that whenever

$$(y_1, \dots, y_m) \in \Gamma_R(Y_1, \dots, Y_m, X_1, \dots, X_n; k, l', \epsilon')$$

we have the inclusion

$$\Gamma_{R'}(X_1, \dots, X_n|y_1, \dots, y_m[Y_1, \dots, Y_m]; k, l', \epsilon') \subset \\ \Gamma_R(X_1, \dots, X_n|p_1(y_1, \dots, y_m), \dots, p_r(y_1, \dots, y_m)[Y_1, \dots, Y_m]; k, l, \epsilon).$$

It follows that

$$\sup_{y_1,\dots,y_m} \log \lambda\Gamma_{R'}(X_1,\dots,X_n|y_1,\dots,y_m[Y_1,\dots,Y_m];k,l',\epsilon') \leq \sup_{z_1,\dots,z_r} \log \lambda\Gamma_R(X_1,\dots,X_n|z_1,\dots,z_r[Z_1,\dots,Z_r];k,l,\epsilon).$$

But this implies $\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m) \leq \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|Z_1,\dots,Z_r)$. ☐

Theorem 2.15. $\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m) = \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|W^*(Y_1,\dots,Y_m))$.

Proof. By definition,

$$\chi = \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|W^*(Y_1,\dots,Y_m)) = \inf_r \inf_{Z_1,\dots,Z_r\in W^*(Y_1,\dots,Y_m)} \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|Z_1,\dots,Z_r).$$

In particular, if $r=m$ and $(Z_1,\dots,Z_r)=(Y_1,\dots,Y_m)$, we have that

$$\chi \leq \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m).$$

But by Proposition 2.14, we also have that, for $Z_1,\dots,Z_r \in W^*(Y_1,\dots,Y_m)$,

$$\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m) \leq \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|Z_1,\dots,Z_r) \leq \chi,$$

so that $\chi = \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m)$. ☐

Proposition 2.16. *If $Y_1,\dots,Y_m \in B$, then $\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|B) \leq \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n : Y_1,\dots,Y_m)$.*

Proof. We have $\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|B) \leq \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m) \leq \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n : Y_1,\dots,Y_m)$. ☐

Theorem 2.17. *Let $B = L^\infty[0,1] \subset M$ be a diffuse commutative von Neumann subalgebra. For each $r=1,\dots,n$ let μ_r be a measure on $[0,1]^2$ determined by*

$$\iint f(x)g(y)d\mu_r(x,y) = \tau(X_r f X_r g).$$

Assume that for at least one $r \in \{1,\dots,n\}$, Lebesgue measure on $[0,1]^2$ is singular with respect to μ_r. Then $\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|B) = -\infty$.

Proof. Let Y be a self-adjoint generator for B. Then we have

$$\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|B) = \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y) \leq \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n : Y) = -\infty$$

because of [5, Corollary 7.7]. ☐

Note that the analogous theorem holds for $\chi^*(\cdots : B)$, see [3].

Proposition 2.18. *Let $p < n$. Then*

$$\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|B) \leq \chi(X_1,\dots,X_p|B) + \chi(X_{m+1},\dots,X_p|B)$$

and a similar inequality holds for χ^ω.

Proof. We clearly have

$$\Gamma_R(X_1,\dots,X_n|y_1,\dots,y_m;k,l,\epsilon) \subset \Gamma_R(X_1,\dots,X_p|y_1,\dots,y_m;k,l,\epsilon)\times \Gamma_R(X_{p+1},\dots,X_n|y_1,\dots,y_m;k,l,\epsilon)$$

so that

$$\sup_{y_1,\ldots,y_m} \log \lambda\Gamma_R(X_1,\ldots,X_n|y_1,\ldots,y_m;k,l,\epsilon) \leq$$
$$\sup_{y_1,\ldots,y_m} \log \lambda\left(\Gamma_R(X_1,\ldots,X_p|y_1,\ldots,y_m;k,l,\epsilon)+\right.$$
$$\log \lambda\Gamma_R(X_{p+1},\ldots,X_n|y_1,\ldots,y_m;k,l,\epsilon) \leq$$
$$\sup_{y_1,\ldots,y_m} \log \lambda\left(\Gamma_R(X_1,\ldots,X_p|y_1,\ldots,y_m;k,l,\epsilon)\right)+$$
$$\sup_{y_1,\ldots,y_m} \log \lambda\left(\Gamma_R(X_{p+1},\ldots,X_{nb}|y_1,\ldots,y_m;k,l,\epsilon\right).$$

This implies the proposition. □

Theorem 2.19. *Let $X_1,\ldots,X_n,X_{n+1},\ldots,X_p \in (M,\tau)$ be self-adjoint non-commutative random variables. Assume that the family $X_1,\ldots,X_n$ is free from the von Neumann algebra generated by B and $X_{n+1},\ldots,X_p$, and assume that B is embeddable into the ultrapower of the hyperfinite II_1 factor. Then*

$$\chi(X_1,\ldots,X_n,X_{n+1},\ldots,X_p|B) = \chi(X_1,\ldots,X_n) + \chi(X_{n+1},\ldots,X_p|B).$$

In particular,

$$\chi(X_1,\ldots X_n|B) = \chi(X_1,\ldots,X_n).$$

The same statements hold for χ^ω.

Proof. It is sufficient to show that

$$\chi(X_1,\ldots,X_n) + \chi(X_{n+1},\ldots,X_p|B) \geq \chi(X_1,\ldots,X_n,X_{n+1},\ldots,X_p|B).$$

Fix $m > 0$ and elements $Y_1,\ldots,Y_m \in B$. Let $y_1,\ldots,y_m \in \Gamma_R(Y_1,\ldots,Y_m;k,l,\epsilon)$; such an m-tuple exists because B can be embedded into the ultrapower of the hyperfinite II$_1$ factor. By Voiculescu's result in [8], we have that the ratio

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{\lambda\Gamma_R(X_1,\ldots,X_n;k,l,\epsilon)\times\Gamma_R(X_{n+1},\ldots,X_p|y_1,\ldots,y_m[Y_1,\ldots,Y_m];k,l,\epsilon)}{\lambda\Gamma_R(X_1,\ldots,X_n,X_{n+1},\ldots,X_p|y_1,\ldots,y_m[Y_1,\ldots,Y_m];k,l,\epsilon)} \geq 1.$$

Indeed, given a $\delta > 0$, there is a k_0, for all $k > k_0$ and for each choice of an approximant

$$(x_{n+1},\ldots,x_p) \in \Gamma_R(X_{n+1},\ldots,X_p|y_1,\ldots,y_m[Y_1,\ldots,Y_m];k,l,\epsilon),$$

there exists an open subset

$$\Gamma_{k,x_{n+1},\ldots,x_p} \subset \Gamma_R(X_1,\ldots,X_n;k,l,\epsilon),$$

so that

$$\frac{\lambda\Gamma_{k,x_{n+1},\ldots,x_p}}{\Gamma_R(X_1,\ldots,X_n;k,l,\epsilon)} > 1-\delta$$

satisfying

$$\Gamma_{k,x_{n+1},\ldots,x_p} \times \{(x_{n+1},\ldots,x_p)\} \subset \Gamma_R(X_1,\ldots,X_n,X_{n+1},\ldots,X_p|y_1,\ldots,y_m[Y_1,\ldots,Y_m];k,l,\frac{\epsilon}{2}).$$

Let $O = O(x_{n+1},\ldots,x_p)$ be an open ball of radius ϵ' for the operator norm on M_k^{n-p}, centered at $x_{n+1},\ldots,x_p$. Then for sufficiently small ϵ' (depending only on k and l), we have

$$\Gamma_{k,x_{n+1},\ldots,x_p} \times O \subset \Gamma_R(X_1,\ldots,X_n,X_{n+1},\ldots,X_p|y_1,\ldots,y_m[Y_1,\ldots,Y_m];k,l,\epsilon).$$

Let

$$\Gamma_k = \bigcup_{x_{n+1},\dots,x_n} \Gamma_{k,x_{n+1},\dots x_p} \times O(x_{n+1},\dots,x_n).$$

Then $\Gamma_k \subset \Gamma_R(X_1,\dots,X_n,X_{n+1},\dots,X_p|y_1,\dots,y_m[Y_1,\dots,Y_m];k,l,\epsilon)$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda\Gamma_R(X_1,\dots,X_n,X_{n+1},\dots,X_p|y_1,\dots,y_m[Y_1,\dots,Y_m];k,l,\epsilon) \geq \lambda\Gamma_k \\ \geq \inf_{x_{n+1},\dots x_p} \lambda\Gamma_{k,x_{n+1},\dots,x_p} \times \lambda\Gamma_R(X_{n+1},\dots,X_p|y_1,\dots,y_m[Y_1,\dots,Y_m];k,l,\epsilon) \\ \geq (1-\delta)\cdot\lambda\Gamma_R(X_1,\dots,X_n;k,l,\epsilon) \times \lambda\Gamma_R(X_{n+1},\dots,X_p|y_1,\dots,y_m[Y_1,\dots,Y_m];k,l,\epsilon).\end{aligned}$$

The statement of the theorem follows. The proof for χ^ω is identical. □

We note that the preceding theorem implies that $\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|B)$ is not always $-\infty$. For example, if $S_1,\dots,S_n$ is a free semicircular family free from a unital von Neumann algebra B, which can be embedded into the ultrapower of the hyperfinite II_1 factor, then $\chi(S_1,\dots,S_n|B) = \frac{n}{2}\log 2\pi e > -\infty$.

Corollary 2.20. *Let $X_1,\dots,X_p$ be random variables. Assume that $X_1,\dots,X_n$ are free from the algebra generated by $X_{n+1},\dots,X_p$ and B. Then*

$$\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n,X_{n+1},\dots,X_p|B) = \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|B) + \chi(X_{n+1},\dots,X_p|B). \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. If B is embeddable into the ultrapower of the hyperfinite II_1 factor, we have by Theorem 2.19 that

$$\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n,X_{n+1},\dots,X_p|B) = \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n) + \chi(X_{n+1},\dots,X_p|B),$$

and also that

$$\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|B) = \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n).$$

If B is not embeddable into the ultrapower of the hyperfinite II_1 factor, then the quantities on both sides of (2.4) are equal to $-\infty$. □

The analogy between $\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|B)$ and $\chi^*(X_1,\dots,X_n : B)$ makes it tempting to conjecture that (2.4) holds under the weaker assumption that $X_1,\dots,X_n$ and $X_{n+1},\dots,X_p$ are free with amalgamation over B; however, we were unable to prove this.

3. Separate change of variables formulas.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $f_i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be diffeomorphisms, and let μ_i be the distribution of X_i. Then*

$$\chi(f_1(X_1),\dots,f_n(X_n)|B) = \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|B) + \sum_{i=1}^n \int\int \frac{\log|f_i(s)-f_i(t)|}{\log|s-t|} d\mu_i(s)d\mu_i(t),$$

and the same formula holds for χ^ω in place of χ.

Proof. It is sufficient to prove the statement assuming further that f_i are identity diffeomorphisms for $i > 1$; we write $f = f_1$. It is moreover sufficient to show that given $Y_1,\dots,Y_m \in B$

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(f_1(X_1),\dots,f_n(X_n)|Y_1,\dots,Y_m) \geq \chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|Y_1,\dots,Y_m) + \\ \int\int \frac{\log|f(s)-f(t)|}{\log|s-t|} d\mu_1(s)d\mu_1(t),\end{aligned}$$

since the reverse inequality follows by replacing f with its inverse. It is shown in [6, Proposition 3.1] that given $\delta > 0$, $\epsilon > 0$, $l > 0$, $R > 0$, there exist $k_0 > 0$, $\epsilon > \epsilon_0 > 0$, $l_0 > l > 0$, such that for all $k > k_0$, $0 < \epsilon' < \epsilon_0$ and $l' > l_0$, the determinant of the map

$$F : (x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_m) \mapsto (f(x_1), x_2, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$$

is bounded below by

$$\exp\left(k^2 \left[\int\int \log \frac{|f(s) - f(t)|}{|s - t|} d\mu_1(s) d\mu_1(t) - \delta\right]\right)$$

for

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_m) \in \Gamma_{R'}(X_1, \ldots, X_n, Y_1, \ldots, Y_m; k, l', \epsilon').$$

Moreover, the image of

$$\Gamma_{R'}(X_1, \ldots, X_n, Y_1, \ldots, Y_m; k, l', \epsilon')$$

under this map is contained in

$$\Gamma_R(f(X_1), \ldots, X_n, Y_1, \ldots, Y_m; k, l, \epsilon).$$

Choose $y_1, \ldots, y_m$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\log \sup_{z_1, \ldots, z_m} \lambda\Gamma_{R'}(X_1, \ldots, X_n | z_1, \ldots, z_m[Y_1, \ldots, Y_m]; k, l', \epsilon') -& \\ \log \lambda\Gamma_{R'}(X_1, \ldots, X_n | y_1, \ldots, y_m[Y_1, \ldots, Y_m]; k, l; , \epsilon') < \delta.&\end{aligned}$$

Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{z_1, \ldots, z_m} \log \lambda\Gamma_{R'}(f(X_1), X_2, \ldots, X_n | z_1, \ldots, z_m[Y_1, \ldots, Y_m]; k, l, \epsilon) \geq& \\ \log \lambda\Gamma_R(f(X_1), \ldots X_n | y_1, \ldots, y_m[Y_1, \ldots, Y_m]; k, l, \epsilon) \geq& \\ \log \lambda F\left(\Gamma_{R'}(X_1, \ldots, X_n | y_1, \ldots, y_m[Y_1, \ldots, Y_m]; k, l', \epsilon')\right) \geq& \\ \log \lambda\Gamma_{R'}(X_1, \ldots, X_n | y_1, \ldots, y_m[Y_1, \ldots, Y_m]; k, l', \epsilon')& \\ + \int\int \frac{\log |f(s) - f(t)|}{\log |s - t|} d\mu_1(s) d\mu_1(t) - \delta k^2 \geq& \\ \log \sup_{z_1, \ldots, z_m} \lambda\Gamma_{R'}(X_1, \ldots, X_n | z_1, \ldots, z_m[Y_1, \ldots, Y_m]; k, l', \epsilon')& \\ + \int\int \frac{\log |f(s) - f(t)|}{\log |s - t|} d\mu_1(s) d\mu_1(t) - 2\delta k^2.&\end{aligned}$$

Taking $\limsup_{k \to \infty}$ gives us that

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_R(f(X_1), \ldots, X_n | y_1, \ldots, y_m[Y_1, \ldots, Y_m]; l, \epsilon) \geq& \\ \chi_{R'}(X_1, \ldots, X_n | y_1, \ldots, y_m[Y_1, \ldots, Y_m]; l', \epsilon')& \\ + \int\int \frac{\log |f(s) - f(t)|}{\log |s - t|} d\mu_1(s) d\mu_1(t),&\end{aligned}$$

which implies the theorem. The proof for χ^ω is exactly the same. □

Proposition 3.2. *If* $\|X_i\| < R$ *for all* i*, then*

$$\chi_R(X_1, \ldots, X_n | B) = \chi(X_1, \ldots, X_n | B),$$

and similarly for χ^ω*.*

The proof is along the lines of that of Theorem 3.1, using the ideas of a similar Proposition in [4], and is therefore omitted.

4. General change of variables formula.

Let $B \subset M$ be a unital subalgebra, and let $F_1, \dots, F_n$ be non-commutative power series with coefficients from B; i.e.,

$$F_i(t_1, \dots, t_n) = \sum_k \sum_{i_1,\dots,i_k} b^{i,0}_{i_1,\dots,i_k} t_{i_1} b^{i,1}_{i_1,\dots,i_k} \dots t_{i_k} b^{i,k}_{i_1,\dots,i_k}.$$

Denote by $B[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ the set of all such power series, which have the property that if $F \in B[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ and $X_1, \dots, X_n$ are self-adjoint, then $F(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ is also self-adjoint. Given $F_i \in B[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ as above, denote by $\hat{F}_i$ the power series

$$\hat{F}_i(z_1, \dots, z_n) = \sum_k \sum_{i_1,\dots,i_k} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \|b^{i,j}_{i_1,\dots,i_k}\| y_{i_1} \dots y_{i_k}.$$

We say that $(R_1, \dots, R_n)$ is a mutiradius of convergence of F_i, if it is the multiradius of convergence of $\hat{F}_i$ (as an ordinary commutative power series).

Let $F \in B[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ be such a power series. Then by the derivative of F with respect to t_i we mean the formal power series $D_i F \in B[t_1, \dots, t_n) \otimes B[t_1, \dots, t_n]$. Here D_i is defined by the following properties; here we think of $B[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ and $B[t_1, \dots, t_n) \otimes B[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ are viewed as bimodules over the algebra generated by B and $t_1, \dots, t_n$ using its obvious left and right actions.

1. D_i is bilinear over the algebra generated by B and $t_1, \dots, t_{i-1}, t_{i+1}, \dots, t_n$;
2. $D_i(t_i) = 1 \otimes 1$;
3. D satisfies the Leibniz rule: $D_i(FG) = (D_i F)G + F(D_i G)$.

As an example,

$$D_1(b_0 t_1 b_1 t_2 b_2 t_1 b_3 t_4 b_4) = b_0 \otimes b_1 t_2 b_2 t_1 b_3 t_4 b_4 + b_0 t_1 b_1 t_2 b_2 \otimes b_3 t_4 b_4.$$

Given a family of non-commutative power series $F_1, \dots, F_n$ with a common multiradius of convergence $(R_1, \dots, R_n)$, we define for $X_1, \dots, X_n \in M$, $\|X_i\| < R_i$, its Jacobian at $X_1, \dots, X_n$, to be the matrix $D_B F(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in M_n \otimes M \otimes M$ whose i, j-th entry is equal to $D_i(F_j)(X_1, \dots, X_n)$.

Note that if $B \subset M_k$ and $x_1, \dots, x_n \in M_k$, then $D_B(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is precisely the Jacobian of the map

$$(z_1, \dots, z_n) \mapsto (F_1(z_1, \dots, z_n), \dots, F_n(z_1, \dots, z_n)),$$

evaluated at $x_1, \dots, x_n$.

The proof of the following Theorem is almost identical to the proof of the change of variables formula given in [4], together with the line of the proof of Theorem 3.1, and is therefore omitted.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $F_i \in B[t_1, \dots, t_n]$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ be non-commutative power series with common multiradius of convergence $(R_1, \dots, R_n)$. Assume that there are non-commutative* *power series G_i, $i = 1, \dots, n$ with common multiradius of convergence $(r_1, \dots, r_n)$, such that for all $i = 1, \dots, n$,*

$$F_i(G_1(t_1, \dots, t_n), \dots, G_n(t_1, \dots, t_n)) = t_i,$$
$$G_i(F_1(t_1, \dots, t_n), \dots, F_n(t_1, \dots, t_n)) = t_i, .$$

Assume that for each i, $\|X_i\| < \min(r_i, R_i)$. Then

$$\chi(F_1(X_1, \dots, X_n), \dots, F_n(X_1, \dots, X_n)|B) =$$
$$\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n|B) + \mathrm{Tr} \otimes \tau \otimes \tau \left(\log |D_B F(X_1, \dots, X_n)|\right).$$

The same formulas hold for χ^ω in place of χ.

We deduce that "free Brownian motion" has a regularizing effect on free entropy (compare [7]). The following proposition follows also from the results of [5], but we could not find its exact statement there.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $S_1, \dots, S_n$ be a free semicircular family, free from the algebra $B = W^*(X_1, \dots, X_n)$. Assume that B is embeddable into the ultrapower of the hyperfinite II_1 factor. Then for all $t > 0$, we have*

$$\chi(X_1 + \sqrt{t} S_1, \dots, X_n + \sqrt{t} S_n) \geq n \log 2\pi e t > -\infty.$$

The same estimate holds for χ^ω.

Proof. By the change of variables formula and Theorem 2.19, we have

$$\chi(X_1 + \sqrt{t} S_1, \dots, X_n + \sqrt{t} S_n) \geq \chi(X_1 + \sqrt{t} S_1, \dots, X_n + \sqrt{t} S_n|B) =$$
$$\chi(\sqrt{t} S_1, \dots, \sqrt{t} S_n) = \frac{n}{2} \log 2\pi e t.$$

□

Theorem 4.3. *Let $P_1, \dots, P_n$ be non-commutative polynomials in n variables with coefficients from B. Assume that $\chi(X_1, \dots, X_n|B) > -\infty$. Then*

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon} \chi(X_1 + \epsilon P_1(X_1, \dots, X_n), \dots, X_n + \epsilon P_n(X_1, \dots, X_n)|B) =$$
$$\sum_i \langle J(X_i : B \vee W^*(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_n), P_i \rangle,$$

where $J(X_i : B \vee W^*(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_n))$ is the first-order conjugate variable to X_i with respect to $B \vee W^*(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_n)$ (cf. [7]). The same equality holds for χ^ω.

Proof. For $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, the transformation F^ϵ defined by

$$F_i^\epsilon(X_1, \dots, X_n) = X_i + \epsilon P_i(X_1, \dots, X_n)$$

is a non-commutative power series in $X_1, \dots, X_n$ with coefficients from B and satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 4.1. It follows that

$$\chi(X_1 + \epsilon P_1(X_1, \dots, X_n), \dots, X_n + P_n(X_1, \dots, X_n)|B) = \chi(X_1, \dots, X_n|B)$$
$$+(\mathrm{Tr} \otimes \tau \otimes \tau) \log |D_B F^\epsilon(X_1, \dots, X_n)|.$$

Hence the derivative in ϵ of $\chi(X_1+\epsilon P_1(X_1,\dots,X_n),\dots,X_n+P_n(X_1,\dots,X_n)|B)$ is equal to the derivative of $(\tau\otimes\tau)\log|D_BF^\epsilon(X_1,\dots,X_n)|$. Notice that

$$D_iF_j^\epsilon(X_1,\dots,X_n)=\delta_{ij}+\epsilon D_j(P_i)(X_1,\dots,X_n),$$

so that

$$D_B(F^\epsilon)(X_1,\dots,X_n)=I+\epsilon M,$$

where I is the identity matrix and

$$M_{ij}=D_iP_j(X_1,\dots,X_n).$$

Hence

$$(D_B(F^\epsilon)(X_1,\dots,X_n)^*D_B(F^\epsilon)(X_1,\dots,X_n))=I+\epsilon(M+M^*+\epsilon M^*M).$$

Since $\log(1+t)$ has a power series expansion around zero, we have that

$$\frac{1}{2}\log(D_B(F^\epsilon)(X_1,\dots,X_n)^*D_B(F^\epsilon)(X_1,\dots,X_n))=I+\frac{\epsilon}{2}(M+M^*)+O(\epsilon^2).$$

It follows that the desired derivative is equal to

$$(\tau\otimes\tau)\left(\frac{1}{2}[M+M^*]\right)=\frac{1}{2}\sum_i\tau\otimes\tau((D_iP_i)(X_1,\dots,X_n)+(D_iP_i)(X_1,\dots,X_n)^*)=$$
$$\sum_i\tau\otimes\tau(D_iP_i)(X_1,\dots,X_n),$$

since F_i maps self-adjoint variables to self-adjoint variables. Hence we have, by the definition of the conjugate variable, that

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon}\chi(X_1+\epsilon P_1(X_1,\dots,X_n),\dots,X_n+P_n(X_1,\dots,X_n)|B)=$$
$$\sum_i\langle J(X_i:B\vee W^*(X_1,\dots,X_{i-1},X_{i+1},\dots,X_n),P_i\rangle,$$

as claimed. □

Recall (see [6]) that a function $\phi(X_1,\dots,X_n)$ is said to attain a local algebraic maximum at $X_1,\dots,X_n$ on the set $S=\{X_1,\dots,X_n:\sum_i\tau(X_i^2)=n\}$, if for all non-commutative polynomials P_i, with coefficients from B there exist $\epsilon_0>0$, such that for all $0<\epsilon<\epsilon_0$,

$$\phi\left(\frac{X_1+\epsilon P_1(X_1,\dots,X_n)}{\|X_1+\epsilon P_1(X_1,\dots,X_n)\|_2},\dots,\frac{X_n+\epsilon P_n(X_1,\dots,X_n)}{\|X_n+\epsilon P_n(X_1,\dots,X_n)\|_2}\right)\le\phi(X_1,\dots,X_n).$$

Clearly this is a much weaker requirement than saying that ϕ attains a maximum on S at $X_1,\dots,X_n$.

Proposition 4.4. *Let B be a von Neumann algebra, embeddable into an ultrapower of the hyperfinite II_1 factor. Then the function $(X_1,\dots,X_n)\mapsto\chi(X_1,\dots,X_n|B)$ attains a local algebraic maximum on the set $\{X_1,\dots,X_n:\sum_i\tau(X_i^2)=n\}$ exactly when $X_1,\dots,X_n$ are n free $(0,1)$ semicircular variables, free from B. The same statement holds for χ^ω.*

Proof. Note that by Corollary 2.9, we have that a global maximum (and hence a local algebraic maximum) is attained by such a semicircular family. Assume that the maximum is attained by some family $X_1, \ldots, X_n$. Then $\chi(X_1, \ldots, X_n|B)$ attains a local algebraic maximum at $X_1, \ldots, X_n$. Therefore, we have that for all non-commutative polynomials P_i with coefficients from B

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon}\chi\left(\frac{X_1 + \epsilon P_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n)}{\|X_1 + \epsilon P_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n)\|_2}, \ldots, \frac{X_n + \epsilon P_n(X_1, \ldots, X_n)}{\|X_n + \epsilon P_n(X_1, \ldots, X_n)\|_2}\middle| B\right) = 0.$$

But this is equal to

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon}\chi(X_1, \ldots, X_n|B) - \frac{d}{d\epsilon}\sum_i \log \|X_i + \epsilon P_i(X_1, \ldots, X_n)\|_2 =$$
$$\sum_i \langle J(X_i : B \vee W^*(X_1, \ldots, X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}, X_n)), P_i\rangle$$
$$-\sum_i \langle X_i, P_i(X_1, \ldots, X_n)\rangle.$$

It follows that for all non-commutative polynomials P_i with coefficients from B,

$$\langle J(X_i : B \vee W^*(X_1, \ldots, X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}, X_n)), P_i\rangle = \langle X_i, P_i(X_1, \ldots, X_n)\rangle,$$

which implies that

$$X_i = J(X_i : B \vee W^*(X_1, \ldots, X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}, X_n))$$

for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$. But by [7] and [3], this implies that $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are a free semicircular family, free from B. □

Theorem 4.5. *Assume that B is embeddable into an ultrapower of the hyperfinite II_1 factor, and $\sum_{i=1}^n \tau(X_i^2) = n$. Then $\chi(X_1, \ldots, X_n|B)$ attains its maximal value of $n \log 2\pi e$ if and only if $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are a free semicircular family, which is free from B. The same statement holds for χ^ω.*

Proof. The condition that $\chi(X_1, \ldots, X_n|B)$ achieves a local algebraic maximum is weaker than the condition that it achieves its maximum, so if the maximum is achieved, the local algebraic maximum is achieved, and Proposition 4.4 applies. Conversely, it was shown in Corollary 2.9 that the given number is indeed a maximum. □

We end with the following theorem, whose proof is identical to that of [6, Proposition 4.3].

Theorem 4.6. *If $\chi(X|B) = \chi(X) \neq -\infty$, then X is free from B. The same statement holds for χ^ω.*

5. $\chi(X_1, \ldots, X_n|B \otimes M_N)$.

Let X_{ij}^k, $i, j = 1, \ldots, N$, $k = 1, \ldots, n$ be non-commutative random variables, such that $X_{ij} = X_{ji}^*$, and let B be a unital subalgebra of (M, τ) . Then the joint $*$-distribution of the family $\{X_{ij}^k\} \cup B$ completely determines and is completely determined by, the joint distribution of the matrices

$$Z_k = \left(\begin{array}{cccc} X^k_{11} & X^k_{12} & \dots & X^k_{1N} \\ X^k_{21} & X^k_{22} & \dots & X^k_{2N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ X^k_{N1} & X^k_{N2} & \dots & X^k_{NN} \end{array} \right),$$

the matrix units $E_{ij} \in M_N$ (matrices whose only non-zero entry is in the position i, j) and the algebra $B \otimes M_N$, identified with those matrices that have entries from B. Therefore, it is natural to expect a relationship between the free entropy of the entries of the matrix relative to B and the free entropy of the matrix relative to the algebra $B \otimes M_N$ of B-valued matrices. Such a property is enjoyed by χ^* (introduced by Voiculescu in [7]; this property for χ^* was proved in [2]).

Let us define

$$Y^k_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(X^k_{ij} + [X^k_{ij}]^*) & \text{if } i \geq j \\ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{-1}}(X^k_{ij} - [X^k_{ij}]^*) & \text{if } i < j. \end{cases}$$

For ω a free ultrafilter (i.e., a homomorphism $\omega : C(\mathbb{N}) \to \mathbb{C}$), from the algebra of continuous bounded functions on $\mathbb{N}$), and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $n\omega$ to be the free ultrafilter, which as a homomorphism from $C(\mathbb{N})$ is given by the composition of ω and the map $n \cdot f$, given by $(n \cdot f)(m) = f(nm)$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $Y_{\{ij\}}$Let ω be a free ultrafilter. Then*

$$\chi^{N\omega}(\{Y^k_{ij}\}_{i,j,k}|B) = N^2\chi^\omega(Z_1, \dots, Z_n|B \otimes M_N) - N^2\frac{n}{2}\log N.$$

Moreover,

$$\chi(\{Y^k_{ij}\}_{i,j,k}) \leq N^2\chi(Z_1, \dots, Z_n|B \otimes M_N) - N^2\frac{n}{2}\log N.$$

Proof. Let E_{ij} be as before. Then

$$\chi^\omega(Z_1, \dots, Z_n|B \otimes M_N) = \inf_{P_1,\dots,P_q \in B} \chi^\omega(Z_1, \dots, Z_n|P_1, \dots, P_q, \{E_{ij}\}_{ij}).$$

Here E_{ij} are not self-adjoint; what we mean by the quantity on the right is the obvious extension of our quantity to such a non-selfadjoint case.

We first claim that

$$\chi^{N\omega}(\{Y^k_{ij}\}_{i,j,k}|B) \geq N^2\chi^\omega(Z_1, \dots, Z_n|B \otimes M_N) - N^2\frac{n}{2}\log N.$$

Assume that $k = Nk'$. Fix $\delta > 0$. Choose $Q_1, \dots, Q_s \in B \otimes M_N$ and $R > 0$ so that

$$\chi^\omega_R(Z_1, \dots, Z_n|Q_1, \dots, Q_q, \{E_{ij}\}_{ij}) \geq \chi^\omega(Z_1, \dots Z_n|B \otimes M_N) - \delta.$$

Let $(e_{ij}) \in \Gamma_R(\{E_{ij}\} : Z_1, \dots Z_n, Q_1, \dots, Q_s; k, l, \epsilon)$. Then by a suitable choice of l, ϵ, k and R, we can guarantee that the exists a projection $p \leq e_{11}$ of rank k', $[e_{11}, p] = 0$. Given δ, choose $q_1, \dots, q_S$ and e_{ij} so that

$$\log \lambda\Gamma_R(Z_1, \dots, Z_n|\{e_{ij}\}, \{q_i\}[\{E_{ij}\}, \{Q_i\}]; k, l, \epsilon) \geq \\ \sup_{(f_{ij}) \in \Gamma_R(\{E_{ij}\}:k,l,\epsilon)} \Gamma_R(Z_1, \dots, Z_n|\{f_{ij}\}[\{E_{ij}\}]; k, l, \epsilon) - \delta k^2$$

Let p be as before, and identify pM_kp with $M_{k'}$. For $(z_1,\dots,z_n)\in M_k^n$, let $z_{ij}^k = pe_{1i}z_ke_{j1}p$ and $q_{ij}^r = pe_{1i}q_re_{j1}p$. Denote by $T = T_{\{e_{ij}\}}$the map from M_k^n to $M_{k'}^{nN^2}$ given by $T(z_1,\dots,z_n) = (y_{ij}^r)_{ijr}$, where

$$y_{ij}^r = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(z_{ij}^r + [z_{ij}^r]^*) & \text{if } i \geq j, \\ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{-1}}(z_{ij}^r - [z_{ij}^r]^*) & \text{if } i < j. \end{cases}$$

It follows that for l, k, R sufficiently large and ϵ sufficiently small, we can assume that the logarithm of the Jacobian of T is at least $-\delta k^2$. Moreover, given l', R' and ϵ' there exist $l > l'$, $R > R'$ and $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon'$, such that

$$T(\Gamma_R(Z_1,\dots,Z_n|\{e_{ij}\},\{q_i\}[\{E_{ij}\},\{Q_i\}];k,l,\epsilon) \subset \Gamma_{R'}(\{Y_{is}^r\}|\{q_{ij}^r\}_{ijr}[\{Q_{ij}^r\}_{ijr}];k',l',\epsilon').$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\log\lambda\Gamma_{R'}(\{Y_{is}^r\}|\{q_{ij}^r\}_{ijr}[\{Q_{ij}^r\}_{ijr}];k',l',\epsilon') \geq \\ &\log\lambda T(\Gamma_R(Z_1,\dots,Z_n|\{e_{ij}\},\{q_i\}[\{E_{ij}\},\{Q_i\}];k,l,\epsilon) \geq \\ &\log\lambda\Gamma_R(Z_1,\dots,Z_n|\{e_{ij}\},\{q_i\}[\{E_{ij}\},\{Q_i\}];k,l,\epsilon) - \delta k^2 \geq \\ \sup_{((f_{ij})_{ij},(p_r)\in\Gamma_R(\{E_{ij}\},\{P_i\}:k,l,\epsilon)} &\log\lambda\Gamma_R(Z_1,\dots,Z_n|\{f_{ij}\},\{p_i\}[\{E_{ij}\},\{Q_i\}];k,l,\epsilon) - 2\delta k^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, remembering that $k = Nk'$ and taking limits as $k\to\omega$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} &\chi_{R'}^{N\omega}(\{Y_{is}^r\}|\{q_{ij}^r\}_{ijr}[\{Q_{ij}^r\}_{ijr}];l',\epsilon') = \\ &\lim_{k\to\omega}\frac{1}{(k')^2}\log\lambda\Gamma_{R'}(\{Y_{is}^r\}\{q_{ij}^r\}_{ijr}[\{Q_{ij}^r\}_{ijr}];k',l',\epsilon') + \frac{N^2n}{2}\log k' = \\ &\lim_{k\to\omega}N^2\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\log\lambda\Gamma_{R'}(\{Y_{is}^r\}\{q_{ij}^r\}_{ijr}[\{Q_{ij}^r\}_{ijr}];k',l',\epsilon') + \frac{n}{2}\log k - \frac{n}{2}\log N\right) \geq \\ &N^2\lim_{k\to\omega}\frac{1}{k^2}\sup_{(f_{ij})\in\Gamma_R(\{E_{ij}\}:k,l,\epsilon)}\log\lambda\Gamma_R(Z_1,\dots,Z_n|\{f_{ij}\},\{q_i\}[\{E_{ij}\},\{Q_i\}];k,l,\epsilon) \\ &+N^2\frac{n}{2}\log k - N^2\frac{n}{2}\log N - 2\delta = \\ &N^2\chi_R^\omega(Z_1,\dots,Z_n|\{E_{ij}\},\{Q_i\}) - N^2\frac{n}{2}\log N - 2\delta \geq \\ &N^2\chi_R^\omega(Z_1,\dots,Z_n|B\otimes M_N;l,\epsilon) - N^2\frac{n}{2}\log N - 3\delta. \end{aligned}$$

This implies the claimed inequality.

Next, we claim that

$$\chi^{N\omega}(\{Y_{ij}^k\}_{i,j,k}|B) \geq N^2\chi^\omega(Z_1,\dots,Z_n|B\otimes M_N) - N^2\frac{n}{2}\log N.$$

For this, choose $Q_1,\dots,Q_n\in B\otimes M_N$ and $R>0$ in such a way that

$$\chi_R^\omega(Z_1,\dots,Z_n|Q_1,\dots Q_n,\{E_{ij}\}) \geq \chi^\omega(Z_1,\dots,Z_n|B\otimes M_N) - \delta.$$

Set $Q_{ij}^r = E_{1i}Q_rE_{j1}$. Choose $\{q_{ij}^r\}\in\Gamma_R(\{Q_{ij}^r\};m,k,\epsilon)$. Assume that

$$(y_{ij}^r)\in\Gamma_R((Y_{ij}^r)|\{q_{ij}^r\}[\{Q_{ij}^r\}];k,l,\epsilon).$$

Then let $x_{ij}^r = y_{ij}^r + \sqrt{-1}y_{ji}^r$. Set $x_r\in M_k\otimes M_N$ to be $x_r = \sum_{ij}x_{ij}^r\otimes E_{ij}$, and put $q_r = \sum q_{ij}^r\otimes E_{ij}\in M_k\otimes M_n$. Then given $R'>0$, $l'>0$ and $\epsilon'>0$, there exist $R>R'>0$, $l>l'>0$ and

$0 < \epsilon < \epsilon'$, such that $(z_1, \dots, z_r) \in \Gamma_{R'}(Z_1, \dots, Z_n | \{E_{ij}\}, \{q_i\}[\{E_{ij}\}, \{Q_i\}]; nk, l', \epsilon')$. Since the map assigning to (y^r_{ij}) the n-tuple $(z_1, \dots, z_r)$ is measure-preserving, we get that

$$\sup_{e_{ij}, f_i} \log \lambda \Gamma_{R'}(Z_1, \dots, Z_n | \{e_{ij}\}, \{f_i\}[\{E_{ij}\}, \{Q_i\}]; nk, l', \epsilon') \geq \\ \log \lambda \Gamma_{R'}(Z_1, \dots, Z_n | \{E_{ij}\}, \{q_i\}[\{E_{ij}\}, \{Q_i\}]; nk, l', \epsilon') \geq \\ \log \lambda \Gamma_R((Y^r_{ij}) | \{q^r_{ij}\}[Q^r_{ij}]; k, l, \epsilon).$$

This implies our claim.

The proof of the inequality for χ instead of χ^ω is along the lines of the proof of the second inequality above, and is left to the reader. ☐

References

1. A. Nica, D. Shlyakhtenko, and R. Speicher, *Maximality of the microstates free entropy for r-diagonal elements*, Preprint, 1998.
2. ———, *Some minimization problems for the free analogue of the fisher information*, Preprint, 1998.
3. D. Shlyakhtenko, *Free entropy with respect to a completely-positive map*, Preprint, 1998.
4. D.-V. Voiculescu, *The analogues of entropy and of Fisher's information measure in free probability theory II*, Invent. Math. **118** (1994), 411–440.
5. ———, *The analogues of entropy and of Fisher's information measure in free probability theory, III*, Geometric and Functional Analysis **6** (1996), 172–199.
6. ———, *The analogues of entropy and of Fisher's information measure in free probability theory, IV: Maximum entropy and freeness*, Free Probability (D.-V. Voiculescu, ed.), American Mathematical Society, 1997, pp. 293–302.
7. ———, *The analogues of entropy and of Fisher's information measure in free probabilility, V*, Invent. Math. **132** (1998), 189–227.
8. ———, *A strengthened asymptotic freeness result for random matrices with applications to free entropy*, IMRN **1** (1998), 41 – 64.

E-mail address: `shlyakht@member.ams.org`

Department of Mathematics, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90095